

# WHO FATHERED CAIN?

Willie Martin

We find the following on pages in a book "Eve Did She Or Didn't She? The Seedline Hypothesis Under Scrutiny" by Evangelist Ted R. Weiland, ISBN 0-9679392-0-8, Library of Congress Number: 00-090494, Published by Mission to Israel Ministries, P.O. Box 248, Scottsbluff, Nebraska 69363)

"So who benefits from this scriptural corruption, and where might you expect to find this Seedline doctrine taught? One Seedline teacher accurately pointed out that this hypothesis is not of modern origin: 'The historicity of a sexual interpretation of original sin can be documented from the literature of antiquity and clearly proves beyond any doubt that this belief did not originate with modern man.' (Scott Stinson, "The Serpent and Eve," The Vision (Schell City, MO: The Church of Israel, July 1998, Volume 2 Number 8) p. 28)

"This is true, but from "what ancient literature" is this hypothesis extracted? This same seedliner documented several instances and in every case the material came from post-Babylonian captivity Judahites. (Now here we really must disagree with Mr. Weiland because at no time in history have the Judahites been Jews. There may have been some who converted to Judaism, but only a few and certainly never the entire tribe of Judah)

"In other words, from Judahites who had been educated in Babylonian traditions. Among others, this seedliner quoted rabbis who quoted the Talmud as "proof" for his Seedline beliefs: '...it (the Seedline hypothesis) was a common teaching among the (post-Babylonian) rabbis of antiquity...In one place, we read: 'rabbi Johanan stated. When the serpent copulated with Eve, he infused her with lust.' (Yebamoth 103b) Another rabbi states: 'Thus I have learnt, that when the serpent had intercourse with Eve he injected defilement into her.' (Haye Sarah 126a) Lastly, another replies: 'You rightly said that when the serpent had carnal intercourse with Eve he injected into her defilement.' (Haye Sarah 126b) (Scott Stinson, "The Serpent and Eve," The Vision (Schell City, MO: The Church of Israel, July 1998, Volume 2 Number 8) p. 28)

This seedliner also quoted several other Babylonian-influenced works of antiquity:

"This (Seedline) interpretation is confirmed in the ancient literature of Israel, especially the commentaries on the Hebrew Bible written in Aramaic and commonly known as Targums. The commentaries were written after the (remnant's, people from the Tribes of Judah, Benjamin and Levi) return from Babylon...One text gives this interpretation of Genesis 4:1: 'And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain; and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like the earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord.' (Targum of Jonathan to Genesis 4:1)

Targum of Jonathan to Genesis 4:1:

“And Adam knew his wife Eve, who was pregnant by the Angel Sammael, and she conceived and bare Cain’ and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like earthly beings, and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord...”

In another Rabbinic work: Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, 21:

“And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord.”

It would appear from those references that the problem with Genesis 4:1 is an omission of some of the words of the Hebrew text. Now quoting from the King James Version and adding the potentially needed words in quotation marks from the Targum of Jonathan so it will make some sense:

“And Adam knew his wife Eve, ‘who was pregnant by Sammael,’ and she conceived and bare Cain, ‘and he was like the heavenly beings, and not like early beings,’ and she said, I have gotten a man from ‘the angel’ of the Lord.”

Once we become aware there is a discrepancy both in the Massoretic and Septuagint texts as opposed to the Aramaic Targums on Genesis 4:1, certain comments by various Biblical scholars start to make sense. Many of the best Hebrew scholars confirm there is a problem with Genesis 4:1! “The Interpreter’s Bible,” a twelve volumes collaborative work of 36 “consulting editors” plus 124 other “contributors” makes the following observation on this verse, vol. 1, page 517:

“Cain seems originally to have been the ancestor of the Kenites...The meaning of the name is ‘metalworker’ or ‘smith;’ here, however, it is represented as a derivation of a word meaning ‘acquire,’ ‘get’ one of the popular etymologies frequent in Genesis; hence the mother’s words I HAVE GOTTEN A MAN – FROM THE LORD (KJV) is a rendering, following the LXX and vulg. Of ‘eth Yahweh, which is literally, ‘with Yahweh,’ and so UNINTELLIGIBLE here (the help of [RSV] is not in the Hebrew). It seems probable that ‘eth should be ‘oth, so, ‘the mark of Yahweh’ and that the words are a gloss...”

Another scholar: Clarke’s Commentary, volume 1, page 58, suggests a contextual problem with Genesis 4:1 as opposed to 1 John 3:12, and being aware the meaning of the Greek word “wicked” in this means “Satan” says the following:

“...Unless she had been under Divine inspiration she could not have called her son (even supposing him to be the promised seed) Jehovah; and that she was not under such an influence her mistake sufficiently proves, for Cain, so far [remote] from begin the Messiah, was of the wicked on; 1 John 3:12...”

To show you that Aramaic was one of the languages spoken for that geographic area at the time of our Messiah, now quoting from “the World Book Encyclopedia,” © 1981, volume 1, page 551:

“ARAMAIC...is an ancient Semitic language that was spoken throughout the Near East from about 700 B.C. to 700 A.D. Jesus spoke an Aramaic dialect. It was the popular tongue of Palestine at the time He lived. The books of Ezra and Daniel were written partly in the

western dialect of Aramaic, Arabic finally took the place of Aramaic, except in a few isolated villages.”

Let’s now observe from “Nelson’s Illustrated Bible Dictionary,” page 167, how some scholars believe some passages in the New Testament are influenced by Targums:

“Some New Testament writers indicate knowledge of targumic interpretation in their quotations from the Old Testament. For example, ‘Vengeance is mine, I will repay’ (Romans 12:19; Hebrews 10:30) is a quotation from Deuteronomy 32:35; but it conforms neither to the Hebrew text nor to the Greek text of the Septuagint. This particular phrase comes from the Targum. Again, the words of Ephesians 4:8, ‘When He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men,’ are taken from Psalm 68:18. But the Hebrew and Septuagint texts speak of the receiving of gifts. Only the Targum on this text mentions the giving of gifts.”

If there were no Targums in written form at that time, how could the New Testament writers have quoted from them?

Perhaps one of the more striking observations is made in a book entitled “Introduction To The Old Testament,” by R.K. Harrison, pages 25 and 231. Here are two excerpts:

“Quite aside from other considerations, there are numerous traces in the LXX of the influence of the Aramaic Targums, making the problem of the agreements between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX one of considerable complexity...It can be shown that many of the quotations of the New Testament writings were derived originally from an Aramaic source or sources, or perhaps even from oral translations, from memory, or from private translations...”

With this evidence, we can see that the Septuagint was affected by Aramaic Targums, the very same Targums which Ted R. Weiland claims are “Babylonian-influenced.” If, then, the Aramaic Targums are unreliable, then, too, is the Septuagint. Further, if the Septuagint is unreliable, so, too, are our present day translations of the New Testament where they cite the Old Testament! In addition to this, there is a footnote at the end of chapter 42 of Job in the Septuagint which says this in part:

“This is translated out of a book in the Syrian language...” [Some designate Aramaic as Syrian].

If this is true, according to Weiland’s criteria, that makes the book of Job also “Babylonian-influenced.” As a Targum of Job written in Aramaic was found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, is confirmation the footnote at the end of Job in the Septuagint is probably correct, although we must reject the statement from the same footnote implying that Job was an Edomite who took an Arabian woman.

Another ancient commentary gives a similar interpretation of the same passage: ‘And Adam knew his wife Eve, who had desired the Angel; and she conceived, and bare Cain; and she said, I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord...” (Palestinian Targum to Genesis 4:1) In another rabbinic work we find a similar interpretation... And she saw that his likeness was not of earthly beings, but of the heavenly beings, and she prophesied and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord.” (Pirke de Rabbi Elieser, 21)

One Rabbinic source states: "Eve bore Cain from the filth of the serpent, and therefore from him were descended all the wicked generations, and from his side is the abode of spirits and demons." (Ahare Moth 76b) A similar explanation for the evil deeds of Cain's lineage is found elsewhere. We read: 'FOR TWO BEINGS HAD INTERCOURSE WITH EVE, AND SHE CONCEIVED FROM BOTH AND BORE TWO CHILDREN. Each followed one of the male parents, to this side and one to the other, and similarly their characters. On the side of Cain are all the haunts of the evil species, from which come evil spirit and demons.' (Bereshith 36b) (Scott Stinson, "The Serpent and Eve," The Vision (Schell City, MO: The Church of Israel, July 1998, Volume 2 Number 8) p. 28-29)

Now we know that Christ said that the Jews are liars in John 8:44 but that does to mean that a liar will not sometimes tell the truth. Therefore one of the very first things those opposed to a literal Satan-spawned physical Seedline do, is point out the fact the information can be found in the Talmud. This is a really sneaky deceptive method used by many, to declare guilt by association. The question must be asked: "Is every single word in the Talmud false?"

This idea is built on the assumption, that if it is found in the Talmud, it is automatically wrong. For anyone who uses this approach, we would challenge them to prove every single word in the Talmud to be false. It simply cannot be done, even though it is a collection of the most evil and blasphemous writings ever put together. Not only is there evidence found in the Talmud substantiating the seduction of Eve, but evidence can be found in "The Lost Books of The bible and The Forgotten books of Eden," "The Protevangelion" 10:1-10:

"And when her sixth month was come, Joseph returned from his building houses abroad, which was his trade, and entering into the house, found the Virgin grown big: Then smiting upon his face, he said, With what face can I look up to the Lord my God? Or, what shall I say concerning this young woman? For I received her a Virgin out of the temple of the Lord my God! And have not preserved her such! Who has thus deceived me? Who has committed this evil in my house, and seducing the Virgin from me, hath defiled her?

**"IS NOT THE HISTORY OF ADAM EXACTLY ACCOMPLISHED IN ME? FOR IN THE VERY INSTANT OF HIS GLORY, THE SERPENT CAME AND FOUND EVE ALONE, AND SEDUCED HER. JUST AFTER THE SAME MANNER IT HAS HAPPENED TO ME.** Then Joseph arising from the ground, called her, and said, O thou who hast been so much favoured by God, why hast thou done this. Why hast thou debased thy soul, who wast educated in the Holy of Holies, and received thy food from the hand of angels? But she, with a flood of tears, replied, I am innocent, and have known no man."

Some even go so far as to cite the Spirit and the Flesh as the Two Seeds. This is one of the most ridiculous, misdirected applications of holy writ to come from one pretending to be inspired. It is so nonsensical, we will not affiliate the sacred Name of Yahweh with it. If one believes the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 are such, this is the way the verse should have read:

"And the Lord God said to Eve's flesh, Because thou hast done this, thy flesh is cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; and thy flesh shall go upon its belly, and dust shalt thy flesh eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between the flesh of the woman and the spirit of the woman, and between the offspring of her flesh and the offspring of her spirit, and offspring of her spirit shall bruise the head of the offspring of her flesh, and the offspring of her flesh will bruise the heel of the offspring of her spirit."

Among other very important details the opponents of Two Seedline doctrine do not explain is: Why is Cain left totally out of the genealogy of Adam? Genesis, Chapter 5, gives the genealogy of Adam to Shem, Ham and Japheth, and Cain is not mentioned once! **WHY?**

Other genealogies in the Bible go into great detail and never leaves out a son! (Especially a firstborn son) If one reads Genesis 4:1 correctly, as depicted, it is not there either. Why is Cain totally left out?? Cain's descendants are mentioned separately in Genesis 4:17-24 and it doesn't list Adam as the father of Cain! **WHY???**

The next place we find Cain in the Scriptures is Genesis 15:19 and we will have to read verses 18 through 21:

"In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, And the Ammonites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." (Genesis 15:18-21) (KJV)

One of these nations among the Canaanites was the **KENITES** (#7017 Strong's) which were **DESCENDANTS OF CAIN**. Being that Cain was of the **SATANIC SEEDLINE**, he would infect his satanic blood **AMONG ALL THESE TEN NATIONS**. And the "Kenizzites" were Edomites.

In the Peake's Commentary on the bible, page 116 we find this about this mixed group of nations spoken of in Genesis 15:19-21:

"When the Israelites entered Canaan they found there a **VERY MIXED** population generally designated by the term Amorite or Canaanite."

The Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 38, says:

"The Kenites. Here are ten nations mentioned, though afterwards reckoned but seven; see Deuteronomy 7:1; Acts 13:19. Probably some of them which existed in Abram's time had been **BLENDED** with others before the time of Moses, so that seven only out of the ten then remained."

### **Kenites:**

"[KEE nights] (metalsmiths)-- the name of a wandering tribe of people who were associated with the Midianites (Judges 1:16) and, later, with the Amalekites (1 Samuel 15:6). The Kenites lived in the desert regions of Sinai, Midian, Edom, Amalek, and the Negev. The Bible first mentions the Kenites as one of the groups that lived in Canaan during the time of Abraham (Genesis 15:19); their territory was to be taken by the Israelites (Numbers 24:21-22). The Kenites were metal craftsmen who may have traced their ancestry to TUBAL-CAIN (a descendant of Cain) (Genesis 4:22). (from Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) (Copyright (C) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers)

The next mention of the descendants of Cain is found in 1 Chronicles 2:55:

"And **THE FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES** which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. **THESE ARE THE KENITES** that came of Hemath, the father of the house of **RECHAB.**" (KJV)

The Wycliff Bible Comentary, editors: Charles F. Pfeiffer & Everett F. Harrison has this to say on page 8, and this quote will cover Genesis 3:14-15:

"**CURSED** (arûr) **ART THOU.** The Lord singled out the originator and instigator of the temptation for special condemnation and degradation. From that moment he must crawl in the dust and even feed on it. He would slither his way along in disgrace, and hatred would be directed against him from all directions. Man would always regard him as a symbol of the degradation of the one who slandered God (cf. Isaiah 65:25). **HE WAS TO REPRESENT NOT MERELY THE SERPENT RACE, BUT THE POWER OF THE EVIL KINGDOM.** As long as life continued, men would hate him and seek to destroy him. **I WILL PUT ENMITY.** The word "êbâ" denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man (cf. Numbers 35:19-20; Ezekiel 25:15-17; 35:5-6) **THOU SHALT BRUISE** (shûp). **A PROPHECY OF CONTINUING STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE DESCENDANTS OF WOMAN AND OF THE SERPENT TO DESTROY EACH OTHER.** The verb shûp is rare (cf. Job 9:17; Psalm 139:11). It is the same in both clauses.

"When translated 'crush' it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in also rendered lie in wait for, aim at or (LXX) watch for. The Vulgate renders it "conteret," "bruise" in the first instance and in this famous passage, **CALLED THE PROTEVAGEFIUM, 'FIRST GOSPEL,'** the announcement of a prolonged struggle, perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of the woman.

"God's promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. Thus assurance fell upon the ears of God's earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption."

The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, Volume 3, page 782:

"**KENITES:** Meaning (metalworkers, smiths). Clan or tribal name of semi-nomadic peoples of South Palestine and Sinai. The Aramaic and Arabic etymologies of the root 'gyn' show that it has to do with metal and metal word (thus the Hebrew word from this root, 'lance'). This probably indicates that the Kenites were metal workers, especially since Sinai and wadi 'arabah were rich in high grade copper ore. W.F. Albright has pointed to the Beni Hassan mural in Egypt (19th century B.C.)

"As an illustration of such a **WONDERING GROUP OF SMITHS.** This mural depicts thirty-six men, women and children in characteristic Semitic dress leading along with other animals, donkeys laden with **MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS**, weapons and an item which Albright has identified as a **BELLOWS.** He has further noted that Lamech's three children (Genesis 4:19-22) were responsible for **HEARDS** (Jubal), **MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS** (Jubal), and **METAL WORK** (Tubal-Cain, or Tubal, **THE SMITH**), the three occupations which seem most evident in the mural...2nd quote from the same article: **THE EARLY MONARCHY.** During this period a significant concentration of Kenites was located in the southern Judean territory. This is clear from 1 Samuel 15:6 cited above and also from David's relations with them."

Postexilic references. In 1 Chronicles 2:55 the **FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES** living at Jabaz are said to be Kenites. Apparently, during the kingdom and exile periods, certain Kenites had given up **NOMADIC SMITHING** and had taken on a more sedentary, but equally honorable **PROFESSION (?) OF SCRIBE**.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible, page 114:

"The etymology of the name suggest **THAT THEY WERE SMITHS OR ARTIFICERS**, a theory which is supported by their association with the Wadi 'Arabah, where there were copper deposits which had been worked by the Egyptians since the middle of the 3rd millennium.

The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole bible has this to say on Kenite, page 293:

**"THE FAMILIES OF THE SCRIBES;** either civil or ecclesiastical officers of the Kenite origin, **WHO ARE HERE CLASSIFIED WITH THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, NOT AS BEING DESCENDED FROM IT,** but as dwellers within its territory, and in a measure **INCORPORATED** with its people."

The Matthew Pool's Commentary On The Holy Bible has this to say on the Kenites, Volume 1, page 778:

**"THE SCRIBES;** either civil, **WHO WERE PUBLIC NOTARIES, WHO WROTE AND SIGNED LEGAL INSTRUMENTS; OR ECCLESIASTICAL...** and are here mentioned not as if they were of the tribe of Judah, but because thy dwelt among them, and probably were allied to them by marriages, and so in a manner incorporated with them. Which dwelt, or rather, dwelt; Hebrew, were dwellers. For the other translation, which dwelt, **MAY SEEM TO INSINUATE THAT THESE WERE DESCENDANTS OF JUDAH, WHICH THEY WERE NOT;** but his translation **ONLY SIGNIFIES COHABITATION WITH THEM,** for which cause they are here named with them.

All these things the Jews do today, here in America. And because Christians have listened to the lying, deceiving, traitorous, Priests of Baal, the Judeo-Christian Clergy they have almost destroyed our nation and are fast destroying our people.

Now that we have established a solid foundation in the Holy Writ concerning the Two Seedline doctrine, let's tell the story in a different way.

With this narrative, the one important fact revealed in the above passages is: Yeashua our Messiah exposed the "Jews" for what they are many years ago.

You could spend thousands of dollars on books updating the story to our present time, and it is still the same old story as it was two thousand years ago, some people today have the audacity to insinuate that Our Redeemer didn't know what he was talking about. We will start this portion of our study with Genesis 3:14-15.

"And Yahweh said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy

(Kenite - "Jewish") seed and her (White) seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

Reread the second paragraph above. The center reference of the KJV then takes us to Revelation 12:9:

"And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

Next we will go unaided to Matthew 3:7:

"But when he (John the Baptist) saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, **O GENERATION (offspring) OF VIPERS**, how can ye, being evil, speak good things for out of the abundance of the heart (genetic intellect) the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things."

From here the KJV center reference takes us to Matthew 13:38:

"The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom (Israelites); but the tares (Jews) are the children of the wicked one."

With a reading of Colossians 2:15 we can see how Yahshua put the Satanic/Jew/Seedline to an open shame and stripped them of their authority.

"And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

Now we will go to Luke 11:49-51 and use this passage rather than Matthew 23:34-36 for there are problems with Matthew's version.

"Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute: That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required (ἐκζητέ\_, to demand an account of) of this generation (#1074, genea); From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation (#1074, genea)."

Here Yahshua is charging the "Jews" with the murder of Abel. It would have been criminally illegal on the part of Yahshua to make such a charge if it were not true. The only way He could legally have produced such a serious charge was if the "Jews" of His day were descended from Cain, for no other person in all of history was responsible for the murder of Abel, but Cain.

There are many unbelievers, who claim to be Christians, who are using Genesis 4:1 to be a stumbling block for Israel; and because of this, we are getting a little annoyed and distraught over all the refuse being promoted by people well-meaning, but who ridicule Two Seedline teaching.



They go to great lengths with their oral gymnastics trying to prove it's all a "spiritual" matter. They scoff at the idea of a GENETIC ENEMY. We are not the one making the claim that it is a matter of GENETICS, but the Bible unmistakably conveys this definite fact in no uncertain terms.

The one-seedliners (or non-seedliners, or may be anti-seedliners) point to Genesis 4:1 where it says:

"And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from Yahweh."

They will say: "You see there, Cain was the son of Adam." They don't seem to realize that Eve was already pregnant with Cain before Adam "knew" her. If they would only take the time to study and see what the rest of the Bible has to say on the matter, they wouldn't come to that erroneous conclusion.

AND THE WOMAN BEHELD SAMMAEL, THE ANGEL OF DEATH, AND WAS AFRAID; YET SHE KNEW THAT THE TREE WAS GOOD TO EAT, AND THAT IT WAS MEDICINE FOR THE ENLIGHTENMENT OF THE EYES, AND DESIRABLE TREE BY MEANS OF WHICH TO UNDERSTAND. And she took of its fruit, and did eat; and she gave to her husband with her, and he did eat.

And THE EYES OF BOTH WERE ENLIGHTENED, AND THEY KNEW THAT THEY WERE NAKED, DIVESTED OF THE PURPLE ROBE IN WHICH THEY HAD BEEN CREATED. And they saw the sight of their shame, and sewed to themselves the leaves of figs, and made to them cinctures. [JERUSALEM. And they made to them vestments.]

And they heard the voice of the word of the Lord God walking in the garden in the repose of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from before the Lord God among the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called to Adam, and said to him, Is not all the world which I have made manifest before Me; the darkness as the light? and how hast thou thought in thine heart to hide from before Me? The place where thou art concealed, do I not see? WHERE ARE THE COMMANDMENTS THAT I COMMANDED THEE?

[JERUSALEM. Walking in the garden in the strength of the day...And the Word of the Lord God called to Adam, and said to him, Behold, the world which I have created is manifest before Me; and how thinkest thou that the place in the midst whereof thou art, is not revealed before Me? Where is the commandment which I taught thee?]

And he said, The voice of Thy Word heard I in the garden, and I was afraid, because I am naked; and the commandment which Thou didst teach me, I have transgressed; therefore I hid myself from shame. And He said, Who showed thee that thou art naked? Unless thou hast eaten of the fruit of the tree of which I commanded that thou shouldst not eat. And Adam said,

The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the fruit of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord God said to the woman, What hast thou done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me with his subtilty, and deceived me with his wickedness, and I ate. And the Lord God brought the three unto judgment; and HE SAID TO THE SERPENT. BECAUSE THOU HAST DONE THIS, CURSED ART THOU OF ALL THE CATTLE,

AND OF ALL THE BEASTS OF THE FIELD; UPON THY BELLY THOU SHALT GO, AND THY FEET SHALL BE CUT OFF, AND THY SKIN THOU SHALT CAST AWAY ONCE IN SEVEN YEARS; AND THE POISON OF DEATH SHALL BE IN THY MOUTH, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN THEE AND THE WOMAN, AND BETWEEN THE SEED OF THY SON, AND THE SEED OF HER SONS; AND IT SHALL BE WHEN THE SONS OF THE WOMAN KEEP THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE LAW, THEY WILL BE PREPARED TO SMITE THEE UPON THY HEAD; BUT WHEN THEY FORSAKE THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE LAW, THOU WILT BE READY TO WOUND THEM IN THEIR HEEL. NEVERTHELESS FOR THEM THERE SHALL BE A MEDICINE, BUT FOR THEE THERE WILL BE NO MEDICINE; AND THEY SHALL MAKE A REMEDY FOR THE HEEL IN THE DAYS OF THE KING MESHIHA.

[JERUSALEM. And IT SHALL BE WHEN THE SONS OF THE WOMAN CONSIDER THE LAW, AND PERFORM (its) INSTRUCTIONS, THEY WILL BE PREPARED TO SMITE THEE ON THY HEAD TO KILL THEE; AND WHEN THE SONS OF THE WOMAN FORSAKE THE COMMANDMENT OF THE LAW, AND PERFORM NOT (its) INSTRUCTIONS, THOU WILT BE READY TO WOUND THEM IN THEIR HEEL, AND HURT THEM.

Nevertheless there shall be a medicine for the sons of the woman, but for thee, serpent, there shall be no medicine: but it is to be that for these there shall be a remedy for the heel in the days of the king Meshiha.] (The Targum of Palestine, commonly entitled The Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, on the Book of Genesis, Section I. Berashith Targum Pseudo-Jonathan)

And the Lord God said to the serpent, Because thou hast done this, more accursed art thou than all cattle, and than all the beasts of the held; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and the dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I WILL PUT ENMITY BETWEEN THEE AND BETWEEN THE WOMAN, AND BETWEEN THY SON AND HER SON. He will remember thee, what thou didst to him (at) from the beginning, and thou shalt be observant unto him at the end. (The Targum of Onkelos on the Book Bereshith or Genesis. Section I. Bereshith Bara Elohim)

Let's consider 1 John 3:12:

“Not as Cain, WHO WAS OF THAT WICKED ONE, AND SLEW HIS (½) BROTHER...” (KJV)

“Do not be like Cain, who belonged to the evil one and murdered his brother. And why did he murder him? Because his own actions were evil and his brother's were righteous.” (NIV)

The New Testament in Modern English, by J.B. Phillips:

“We are none of us to have the spirit of Cain, who was A SON OF THE DEVIL...”

Ferror Fenton Translation:

“Because this is the doctrine which you learned from the first, that we should love one another; NOT BEING IMPELLED BY THE WICKED ONE, AS CAIN WAS, WHO MURDERED HIS BROTHER.?”

Smith and Goodspeed:

“We must not be like Cain who was a CHILD OF THE EVIL ONE...”

Living Bible:

“We are not to be like Cain, WHO BELONGED TO SATAN...”

New English Bible:

“...unlike Cain WHO WAS A CHILD OF THE EVIL ONE...”

New Century Bible:

“Do not be like CAIN, WHO WAS FROM THE EVIL ONE...”

The Modern Reader’s Bible:

“...not to be like CAIN WHO WAS OF THE EVIL ONE...”

The New Jerusalem Bible:

“...not as CAIN WHO WAS FROM THE EVIL ONE...”

The American Standard:

“NOT AS CAIN WAS OF THE EVIL ONE, and slew his brother.”

New International Version:

“Do not be like CAIN, WHO BELONGED TO THE EVIL ONE and murdered his brother.”

Here John can be talking about only one person and that person is Cain, the son of Eve. Here also, please note, the word “of” in Greek is #1537 in the Strong’s Concordance. When used implying a person, it means “a son of.” (We will develop more on this shortly) To show this, we will consider some of the various translations of the Bible on 1 John 3:12.

Of: Strong’s Concordance: #1537 ek (ek) or ex (ex); a primary preposition denoting origin (the point whence action or motion proceeds), from, out (of place, time, or cause; literal or figurative; direct or remote): KJV-- after, among, X are, at, betwixt (-yond), by (the means of), exceedingly, (+abundantly above), for (-th), from (among, forth, up), + grudgingly, + heartily, X heavenly, X hereby, + very highly, in, ... ly, (because, by reason) of, off (from), on, out among (from, of), over, since, X thenceforth, through, X unto, X vehemently, with (-out). Often used in composition, with the same general import; often of completion.

Of: Thayer’s Definition: #1537 ek or ex-out of, from, by, away from.

Now that we have consulted some various translation on 1 John 3:12, let’s take a look at some Bible commentaries on this same verse:

The Wycliffe Bible Commentary page 1473:

“HE (Cain) IS SAID TO HAVE BELONGED TO THE FAMILY OF THE WICKED ONE.”

Matthew Poole’s Commentary On The Holy Bible, volume 3, page 936:

“WHICH SHOWED HIM (Cain) TO BE OF THAT WICKED ONE, OF THE SERPENT’S SEED” so early was such seed sown, and so ancient THE ENMITY BETWEEN SEED AND SEED.”

Matthew Henry’s Commentary, volume 6, page 1077:

“IT SHOWED THAT HE (Cain) was as the firstborn of the serpent’s seed...”

“But WHO WAS CAIN? Ek (grk 1537) tou (grk 3588) poneerou (grk 4190) een (grk 2258), HE WAS OF THE DEVIL.” (from Adam Clarke Commentary)

That it is speaking concerning the GENETICS of Cain and his descendants compared to the GENETICS of the woman and her descendants can be readily observed in 1 John 3:9 (three verses before) contrasting the seed (offspring) of the serpent and the seed (offspring) of the woman:

“Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed (spérma) remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.”

Seed: Strong’s Concordance: #4690 sperma (sper'-mah); from 4687; something sown, i.e. seed (including the male "sperm"); by implication, offspring; specifically, a remnant (figuratively, as if kept over for planting): KJV-- issue, seed.

#4687: speiro (spi'-ro); probably strengthened from 4685 (through the idea of extending); to scatter, i.e. sow (literally or figuratively): KJV-- sow (-er), receive seed.

Seed: Thayer’s Definition: #4690 sperma-

1) from which a plant germinates

a) the seed, that is, the grain or kernel which

contains within itself the germ of the future

plants; used of the grains or kernels sown

b) metaphorically, a seed, that is, a residue, or a few

survivors reserved as the germ of a new race (just as seed is kept from the harvest for the sowing)

2) the semen virile

a) the product of this semen, seed, children,

offspring, progeny

b) family, race, posterity

c) whatever possesses vital force or life giving

power; used of divine energy of the Holy Spirit operating within the soul by which we are regenerated.

Here the word for seed in the Strong's Concordance is the Greek word #4690, spérma, AND YOU CAN'T GET ANY MORE GENETIC THAN THAT! In other words, the reason the descendants of Satan through Cain (the "Jews") act the way they do is because it is in their GENES. Likewise those born of Adam and Eve, the offspring of Yahweh, will behave according to their GENETICS.

There is a real problem with the word "seed," spérma, expressed by W.E. Vine in his An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. This is what he says on page 339:

"While the plural form 'seeds,' neither in Hebrew nor in Greek, would have been natural any more than in English (It is not used in Scripture of human offspring; its plural occurrence is in 1 Samuel 8:15, of crops), yet if the Divine intention had been to refer to Abraham's natural descendants, another word would have been chosen in the plural, such as 'children'..."

Note: There is nothing wrong with the first half of Vine's statement, which is actually helpful, explaining that in Hebrew and Greek a singular "seed" is used to denote a COLLECTIVE PLURAL, as in English. It is the second half of Vine's statement which is faulty, using a word that described a COLLECTIVE and limiting it to a SINGLE ONE.

Further, in the original Hebrew, it may very well be that "seed" is always singular except in 1 Samuel 8:15, where MULTIPLE VARIETIES are implied, and the PLURAL would certainly be proper. It would, therefore, be proper to indicate that Eve's "seed," like Jacob's "seed," would be a SINGULAR KIND OF SEED.

There is a world of difference between a SINGLE VARIETY OF SEED and a SINGLE SEED. How are we to interpret Genesis 17:7 where it says: "...thy SEED AFTER THEIR GENERATIONS(S)?" It should be noted that all of Yahweh's Covenants with Adam-man wee made with a SINGLE VARIETY OF "SEED." The word "seed" in Scripture is important, for it excludes all those who are not "seed." Whether or not Vine had an ax to grind is hard to say, but he doesn't seem to ring entirely true according to Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies, page 377 where Wilson states concerning this word:

"...semen virile, hence children, offspring, posterity; spoken also of one child when an only one..."

It would seem that Vine is applying the singular "seed," spérma, in all cases, whether in a collective sense of in situations where there is but one child. Also, Vine's statement does not square with #2233 (seed) in the Gensenius' Old Testament Lexicon. We believe that many of the one-seedliners have been misled by Vine.

By Vine applying a false premise for the word “seed,” spérma, it would be hard to estimate his influence in many Bible commentaries and religious books. There is one thing about it: either Vine is wrong or Wilson is wrong. It should also be noted, Vine referred to various “rabbis” regarding the word “seed.” More than likely, this is where he got the idea that in all Scripture, both Old and New Testament, in every case, the word “seed” was used in the singular.

### How The Idea of One Seed Came About

If you will look up #2233 in your Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, page 255, you will find the following comment in brackets, which indicates it is the writer’s opinion:

“[The remark upon Genesis 3:15 is intended apparently to contradict its application to the Lord Jesus Christ and his redemption, as if he could not be the seed of the woman; in reply it will here suffice to remark, that in the very passage cited, immediately after Genesis 4:25, it is clear that {2233, seed} is used of one son, namely, Seth, when he was not an only one, because Cain was yet alive; and further, this seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the tempter, ‘thy head,’ which can in no sense apply to any but Christ individually, who became incarnate ‘that by means of death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil.’]”

There are several things the writer has assumed which really are not in context or Biblically applied correctly:

- 1). The death of Yahshua was not the bruising of the head of the serpent, but the bruising of the heel of the Messiah for He arose again;
- 2). The “seed” of the woman of Genesis 3:15 is not implied in the singular, for Hebrews 2:11 it indicates Yahshua has many physical brethren, and He is not ashamed to call them as such. Also, we would remind you again of Genesis 17:7 quoted above;
- 3). In Romans 16:20, Paul told the Romans they would soon tread upon the head of Satan. By Yahshua using the Romans as His representatives to do this, suggests very strongly, with this “bruising,” He was NOT acting in a “singular” individual sense. No doubt, this “bruising” took place when the Roman army besieged Jerusalem, for the majority of “Jews” there at that time were of their father, Satan.

Those who know the story of the establishing of Rome, understand it was founded under the sign of the wolf, Romulus and Remus. This is the insignia of Benjamin. In other words, many of the Roman soldiers under Titus were Benjamites. Also Zerah-Judah had settled in that same area at one time and probably had a bigger role than imagined, and was in all likelihood part of that Roman army.

Also, if you will check Josephus Antiquities 17:8:3, you will find there were Israelite-Germans and Israelite-Galatians (Scythians and Kelts) in that Roman Army to help bruise the serpent’s head. With this, Yahshua was using His people Israel to incapacitate the Satanic “seed” at Jerusalem. While the Serpent’s head was bruised with the siege of Jerusalem, we are sure that it was just the beginning of the bruising which he will eventually receive.

From The Wycliffe Bible Commentary. Copyright (c) 1962 by Moody Press:

“And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

I will put enmity. The word ('eba) denotes the blood-feud that runs deepest in the heart of man (cf. Numbers 35:19-20; Ezekiel 25:15-17; 35:5-6). Thou shalt bruise (shup). A prophecy of a continuing struggle between the descendants of woman and of the serpent to destroy each other. The verb (shup) is rare (cf. Job 9:17; Psalm 139:11). It is the same in both clauses. When translated crush, it seems appropriate to the reference concerning the head of the serpent, but not quite so accurate in describing the attack of the serpent on man's heel. It is also rendered (lie in wait for, aim at), or (LXX) (watch for). The Vulgate renders it conteret, 'bruise,' in the first instance and insidiaberis, 'lie in wait,' in the other clause. Thus, we have in this famous passage, called the protevangelium, "first gospel," the announcement of a prolonged struggle, perpetual antagonism, wounds on both sides, and eventual victory for the seed of woman. God's promise that the head of the serpent was to be crushed pointed forward to the coming of Messiah and guaranteed victory. This assurance fell upon the ears of God's earliest creatures as a blessed hope of redemption. An unfortunate translation in the Vulgate changes the pronoun his (v. 15 c) from the masculine to the feminine, providing spurious support for unfounded claims concerning "the Blessed Virgin Mary."

From this, it is obvious the “seed of the woman” of Genesis 3:15 is COLLECTIVE in nature as well as the serpent’s “seed.” Let’s now consider John 8:44:

Smith and Goodspeed on John 8:44

“The devil is the father YOU ARE SPRUNG FROM, and you want to carry out your father’s wishes. He was a murderer from the first, and he has nothing to do with truth, for there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he speaks in his true character, for he is a liar and the father of them.”

You can see very clearly, then, this verse is not speaking in a “spiritual” sense as most one-seedliners would have you to believe. If so, how would one murder someone spiritually?

It would be ridiculously absurd to interpret this verse in a “spiritual” manner. When it is speaking of murder in this verse, it is speaking of Cain murdering Abel. It is not speaking of Cain murdering Abel “spiritually,” but physically. We are not the only ones who understands this verse in such a way.

The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge, edited by Jerome H. Smith, published by the Thomas Nelson Publishers, page 1203, understands John 8:44 to be speaking of the murder of Abel by Cain, for it makes reference to Genesis 4:8. This is an entire book of cross-references. As far as we know, this book is in no way promoting the Two Seedline doctrine, nor does it have an ax to grind on this subject.

Let’s take a look at Genesis 4:8 to which this book makes reference from John 8:44:

“And Cain talked with Abel his brother; and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.”

The Living Bible relates this verse as:

“For you are the children of your father the devil and you love to do the evil things he does. He was a murderer from the beginning and a hater of truth— there is not an iota of truth in him. When he lies, it is perfectly normal; for he is the father of liars.” (John 8:44) (TLB)

For evidence to help prove that John 8:44 is speaking of the “Jews” as being descendants of Cain, and that Smith and Goodspeed have translated this passage correctly, we will check on the word “OF,” like in “Ye are OF your father the devil.”

Of: Strong’s Concordance: #1537 ek (ek) or ex (ex); a primary preposition denoting origin (the point whence action or motion proceeds), from, out (of place, time, or cause; literal or figurative; direct or remote): KJV-- after, among, X are, at, betwixt (-yond), by (the means of), exceedingly, (+abundantly above), for (-th), from (among, forth, up), + grudgingly, + heartily, X heavenly, X hereby, + very highly, in, ...ly, (because, by reason) of, off (from), on, out among (from, of), over, since, X thenceforth, through, X unto, X vehemently, with (-out). Often used in composition, with the same general import; often of completion.

The Strong’s number, as you can see, in the Greek is #1537. The New Testament Word Study Dictionary, by Dr. Spiros Zodhiates devotes five pages to define and expound the word “OF” as used in the Greek, pages 529-534. Obviously, we cannot quote the entire document here, but cite only that which is relevant to John 8:44:

“#1537: “...Preposition governing the genitive, primarily meaning out of, from, of, as spoken of such objects which were before another...Of the origin or source of anything, i.e., the primary, direct, immediate source...OF PERSONS, OF THE PLACE, STOCK, FAMILY, CONDITION, MEANING OUT OF WHICH ONE IS DERIVED OR TO WHICH HE BELONGS...Of the source, i.e., the person or thing, out of or from which anything proceeds, is derived, or to which it pertains...”

As we stated before herein, we really need to examine the word “OF” in John 8:44, for it is very critical in understanding that the “Jews” are the descendants of Cain. Most one-seedliners will claim John 8:44 should be taken SPIRITUALLY only; that it is not speaking of a literal GENETIC offspring of Satan through Cain. Jeffrey A. Weakley (a one-seedliner) in his 1994 booklet *The Satanic Seedline, Its Doctrine and History*, page 24, in his attempt to discredit the Two Seedline teaching, says this of John 8:44 (this is an “Argument” and “Answer” debate conducted solely by him in his booklet):

“This does not show that Cain was of that wicked one physically, but rather he was of that wicked one SPIRITUALLY. Let’s look at part of 1 John 3:8: ‘He that committeth sin is of the devil...’ When one studies out 1 John 3:8-12 the meaning become crystal clear. It must be talking about who are we serving spiritually. If it is talking about physical descendants, then all of us are physical descendants of Satan because we all have sinned. ‘For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God...’ (Romans 3:23)...So if we have all sinned and if he that committeth sin is of the devil...So what is it saying? Are you of the devil by physical descent or are you of the devil because you serve him (or have served him in the past)?’...’Argument [of the two seedliner]: John 8:44 says, ‘Ye are of your father the devil...This shows that the devil is their physical father’...’Answer [by Jeffery A. Weakley]: ‘Wrong. This once again shows that the devil is their SPIRITUAL FATHER (the one that they serve).’”



We must then determine whether John 8:44 is speaking of a “spiritual children or a physical children.” The word “OF” is critical in John 8:44 for determining this. The word in the Greek is #1537. In John 8:44 the Greek form is: ἐξ. You can check this out in most any of the Greek interlinear.

The New Testament Greek Study Aids, by Walter Jerry Clark, says, on page 230, about the Greek word ἐκ: “out of...with the genitive: by means of, out of.” The Intermediate New Testament Greek by Richard A. Young, page 95 says the following about the Greek word ἐκ: “ἐκ often conveys special extensions ‘out of’ or ‘from.’ For example, the prophet said that God would call His Son out of Egypt (Matthew 2:15).”

From the Greek to English Interlinear by George Ricker Berry, page 31 of his “Greek-English New Testament Lexicon,” we have this on ἐκ: “ἐκ or before a vowel, ἐξ, a preposition governing genitive, from, out of.” The Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, page 189 expresses ἐκ this way: “...out of, as separation from something with which there has been close connection...” In other words, the “Pharisees” in John 8:44 had a close GENETIC connection OUT OF or FROM “the devil.”

There are 32 other places in the New Testament where this Greek word (#1537) ἐκ is used in the same sense. Let’s see if these other passages are speaking of physical or “spiritual” beings. In Matthew 1:3 it speaks of “Phares and Zara being ‘OF’ Tamar.” Does that sound “spiritual?”

Again in Matthew 1:5 it says: “Booz begat Obed ‘OF’ Ruth.” Again, does that sound “spiritual?” In Matthew 1:18 it speaks of the “child ‘OF’ the Holy Ghost.” Again, does that sound “spiritual?” In Matthew 1:20 it again speaks of the “child being ‘OF’ the holy Ghost.” Again, does that sound “spiritual?” In Mark 5:8 the Redeemer commanded an unclean spirit to ‘come out ‘OF’ THE MAN.” Does the “man” from which the spirit was cast, sound “spiritual?”

In Luke 2:36 it speaks of one “Phanuel ‘OF’ the tribe of Asher.” Does this sound like a real person or a spirit? In Acts 13:21 it speaks of “a man ‘OF’ the tribe of Benjamin.” Again, are we talking “spiritually” here? In Romans 1:3 it speaks of Yahshua being “made ‘OF’ the seed of David ACCORDING TO THE FLESH.” How do the one-seedliners claim this one to be “spiritual” when it states outright, “flesh?” After all, it’s the same word “OF” as used in John 8:44?!!?

In Romans 16:10 it speaks of “them which are ‘OF’ aristobutus’ [household].” Can we ask again if this is someone who is a real person or something strangely “spiritual?” In Romans 16:11 it speaks of “them that be ‘OF’ the [household] of Narcissus.” Does the word “OF” here apply to some real person or do we have to relegate it to something “spiritual?” In 1 Corinthians 11:12, it says “the woman [is] ‘OF’ the man.” We can just imagine some ardent one-seedliner explaining to his wife she is not a real person.

In Philippians 4:22 it speaks of “they that are ‘OF’ Caesar’s household.” We guess that we Two Seedliners are now supposed to believe that Caesar was something spiritual. In Hebrews 7:5 it speaks of “the sons ‘OF’ Levi...” And “out ‘OF’ the loins of Abraham.” We guess the one-seedliners would not have us Two Seedliners to believe that the Levite’s and Abraham’s LOINS were some kind of a “spiritual” mirage.

In 1 John 3:8 we are told: "He that committeth sin is 'OF' the devil." The devil (Satan) was the original lawbreaker, and that is what sin is all about. In 1 John 3:12 it further describes "Cain [who] was 'OF' that wicked one." The one-seedliners really do some rhetorical gymnastics with this passage. Jeffrey A. Weakley said this passage was also "spiritual." In Revelation 3:9 it states: "I will make them 'OF' the synagogue of Satan..." A synagogue is a worship house of Satan. The "Jews" truly do worship Satan their father and they admit with their own words that they are descended from Cain. We have in our possession a quotation from a publican Liberal Judaism published January, 1949 by a Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver who states in part, speaking of the then new State of Israel: "...the concept of the WANDERING JEW 'WANDERER' over the face of the earth has been removed..." It is only the one-seedliners who do not understand that Cain was to be a "vagabond," a "wanderer" and having the "CURSE OF CAIN" upon them.

Name one other group today that fits this category. In Revelation 5:5 it speaks of "the Lion of the tribe 'OF' Judah." Are we also supposed to believe that this is something "spiritual," and deny that Yahshua came in the flesh? In Revelation 7:5-8 we have: "'OF' the tribe of Judah...'OF' the tribe of Reuben...'OF' the tribe of Gad...'OF' the tribe of Asher...'OF' the tribe of Nephthalim...'OF' the tribe of Manasses...'OF' the tribe of Simeon...'OF' the tribe of Levi...'OF' the tribe of Issachar...'OF' the tribe of Zabulon...'OF' the tribe of Joseph...'OF' the tribe of Benjamin." If we are to be consistent, (a word which the one-seedliners like to use), if the same Greek word that is used in all of these references is physical in nature, SO, TOO, IS THE WORD "OF" IN JOHN 8:44. Very convenient to throw up the word "spiritual" whenever one wants to forge a barrier and not accept the truth which Yahshua spoke: "Ye are OF your father the devil." Yahshua was simply saying to the "Jews" that they were GENETIC chips off the old block.

Also, we suggest that most people who use the word "spiritual" in this way don't even know what the word means. The dictionary might lead to the idea of a disembodied soul or an apparition; something mysterious or mystic. The bible meaning for "spiritual" is: life as opposed to death. How does such a description of the word "spiritual" fit John 8:44? It's obvious, it doesn't.

### Women Have "Seed" Too

While women do not produce sperm, they contribute as much to the DNA of a child as does the man. The very instant at which the sperm unites with the ovum is when the life of a newly conceived child begins. This very first united living cell begins the birth process. This process is then continued until every single cell in the newly formed child is married with the blueprints of both the father and the mother. Science knows today that each single cell of the human body has two sets of 23 chromosomes, or a total of 46. We will now quote The World Book Encyclopedia, volume 9, page 192d:

"Every human body cell contains two sets of 23 chromosomes. These two sets look very much alike. Each chromosome in one set can be matched with a particular chromosome in the other set. Egg cells and sperm cells have only one set of 23 chromosomes. These cells are formed in a special way, and end up with only half the number of chromosomes found in body cells. As a result, when an egg and a sperm come together, the fertilized egg cell will contain the 46 chromosomes of a normal body cell. Half of the chromosomes come from the mother, and half from the father."

With this in mind, we know then, the female supplies 23 chromosomes from one of her egg cells and the male supplies the other 23 chromosomes from one of his sperm cells. Once we understand this, it gives a better portrayal of what the Bible is talking about when it mentions the word “seed.” One particular one-seedliner, Charles Weisman, went to great lengths to try to prove Eve didn’t have any “seed.” Inasmuch as Eve was taken from Adam, she could only have the very identical DNA (or “seed”) as Adam.

### The Parable of The “Tares”

The parable of the wheat and the tares is found in Matthew 3:24-30; 37-43. Sandwiched in-between these passages in verse 35 is the statement:

“I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.”

Yahshua then revealed the significance of the parable as meaning He, being Yahweh, had fathered the good “seed” (wheat), and that THE TARES WERE FATHERED BY THE WICKED ONE. At this point, His disciples were introduced to the Two Seedline doctrine. If the disciples had understood it before, they wouldn’t have made the request to Him to “declare the parable.”

The declarations of the wheat and the tares are as follows:

- 1). The good seed, Spérma, (Adam and his descendants) were fathered by the Son of Man (Son of Adam, Yahweh/Yahshua);
- 2). The field is the world;
- 3). The good seed (Adamites), are the GENETIC sons of Yahweh;
- 4). The tares (“Jews”) are the GENETIC sons of Satan;
- 5). The enemy that fathered the tares is the serpent of Genesis 3:15;
- 6). The harvest of both the wheat and the tares is at the end of the age;
- 7). The reapers are messengers (angels) identifying both the wheat and tares;
- 8). The tares are gathered by the messengers and put into fiery judgment;
- 9). The tares will wail and gnash their teeth at the messenger’s Two Seedline message;
- 10). Then the GENETIC sons of Adam will shine as the sun, and will inherit the kingdom after the tares are destroyed.

The one-seedliners are identifying the “wheat,” but the Two Seedliners are identifying both the “wheat” and the “tares!” Only the messengers of Two Seedline fit this description as angels. While Judeo-churchianity claims the “tares” are the “wheat,” the one seedliners declare there are no “tares.” We guess that makes the one-seedliners half Judeo-churchianity and half Israel Identity with only a half a message! (Maybe, also, half hot and half cold? Revelation 3:15-16, lukewarm).

The Book of Enoch, 22:6-7 speaks of this WAR where it says:

“Then I inquired of Raphael, an angel who was with me, and said: Whose spirit is that, the voice of which reaches to heaven, and accuses? He answered, saying: This is the spirit of Abel, who was slain by Cain his [dizygotic] brother; and he will accuse him, until his seed be destroyed from the face of the earth.”

We added the word “dizygotic” to the above quote inasmuch as Cain was only a half brother. Because Cain’s descendants (the “Jews”) have as yet to be totally destroyed. Abel’s blood is still crying from the ground. We know there are some in Israel Identity who claim that Abel, because he shared the womb with Cain, was of polluted seed We do not share that premise, for our Bible says Abel was “Righteous,” (Matthew 23:35)

Abel could not have been considered Righteous if he was of polluted seed. We read in Genesis 4:25 that Seth was appointed as another seed in place of Abel. Therefore, Seth was the same identical seed as Abel. The word “Seth” is #8352 in the Strong’s Concordance and means “substitute.” Substitute for whom? If Seth were of pure seed, he couldn’t have been a substitute for polluted seed, could he?

There is medical proof that two fathers could impregnate the same woman, and the children would have two different fathers and one mother. You can check with your own local doctor for the proof of this.

Then we have the story of God hating Esau, but loved Jacob; both were of the same father though, and the same mother, and came out of the same womb.

“And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.” (Malachi 1:3)

For a second witness:

“As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.” (Romans 9:13)

For a moment, let’s consider the argument the anti-seedliners put forth that Cain was a full-blooded son of Adam. Let’s just stop and think for a moment:

- 1). Cain and Abel are born;
- 2). Cain kills Abel;
- 3). Cain is kicked out of the family;
- 4). There are no qualified heirs for Adam. If then, Seth were a substitute, he would, by Law, have to be a substitute for the disinherited firstborn Cain. Why, then, does Genesis 4:25 indicate Seth is a replacement for Abel instead of Cain?

Even if Cain was disqualified for the act of murder, Seth legally would have to be a replacement for Cain, the firstborn son. If you will remember, in the case of Judah and his Canaanite wife, he had three sons by her, yet Pharez, his fourth-born son by Tamar was considered his firstborn. Actually, Cain was a son of Adam, a stepson, for when Cain was

born of Eve his wife, Adam became his legal father, just as in the case of Mary, the messiah became the legal stepson of Joseph.

And, just as in Matthew 13:55, James, Joses, Simon and Judas are called Yahshua's brothers when they were only half brothers, or maybe, only leal brothers if they were children of Joseph by a former marriage.

Before we quit this concept of Seth's seed being a replacement for Abel's seed, let's look into another aspect of this thing. In the Bible there is a thing called the Levitate Law.

If an Israelite wife's husband was killed in battle, and they had no children, the Law required a brother to supply his seed so the widowed wife might be able to raise up seed (children) to her deceased husband. Because both the husband's and brother's seed were identical, it was considered her husband's seed.

The only way Abel's blood can be crying from the ground for revenge is: If Seth is the identical seed as Abel, and that Seth's seed will, in the end, destroy Cain's seed. If what we are saying here is true, we, as Israelites, are descendants of Abel as well as Seth. Thus, we must avenge Cain on behalf for Abel's seed.

Here are some excerpts concerning Cain and Abel taken from Matthew Henry's Commentary, volume 1, pages 38, 40, 41 and 43 on chapter 4 of Genesis. In these separate quotations, you will notice several very outstanding observations which could constitute individual lessons in themselves:

"The Pharisees walked in this way of Cain, when they neither entered into the kingdom of God themselves nor suffered those that were entering to go in, Luke 11:52...A fruit of the enmity which is the SEED OF THE SERPENT against the SEED OF THE WOMAN. As Abel leads the van in the noble army of martyrs (Matthew 23:35), so Cain stands in the front of the ignoble army of persecutors, Jude 11. So early did HE THAT WAS AFTER THE FLESH PERSECUTE HIM THAT WAS AFTER THE SPIRIT; and so it is now, more or less (Galatians 4:29), and so it will be till the war shall end in the eternal salvation of all the saints and the eternal perdition of all that hate them... Thus, in Cain, the devil was both a murderer and a liar from the beginning...He [Cain] went and dwelt on the east of Eden, somewhat distant from the place where Adam and his religious family resided, distinguishing himself and HIS ACCURSED GENERATION from the HOLY SEED."

The anti-seedliners point to Genesis 4:1 quoting:

"And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain..." and say: "that settle the matter. Adam was Cain's father." The problem is: they are reading the account in English and it was originally written in Hebrew. In the original Hebrew, there were no punctuation marks; no capital letters at the beginning of a sentence nor periods at the end; there were no vowels; nor were there any chapter and verse divisions as we know them today. Therefore, we have to hope that the translators put all of these things in their proper places. Yet we know that they didn't always do that, for many times part of a topic is given at the end of one chapter, and continued into the first part of the following chapter. So, if they were inconsistent with the chapter and verse divisions, so mighty they also be on these other things.

In Ralph Woodrow's Babylon Mystery Religion, page 146, there is a footnote which reads:

“Note: When the Bible was originally written, commas (and other punctuation marks) were completely unknown. Punctuation marks were invented by Aldus Manutius in the Fifteenth Century. Since the original manuscripts had no punctuation marks, the translators placed commas wherever they thought they should go; based entirely on their beliefs...”

With this, you can begin to see the problem we are up against with the interpretation of Genesis 4:1. We must give the translators credit though, as they placed a semicolon (;) between, “And Adam knew Eve his wife” (;) “and she conceived and bore Cain.” A semicolon indicates the greatest degree of separation possible within a sentence before dividing it into two separate sentences. It is our opinion that the translators should have used two separate sentences in this case as Adam knowing Eve, in this particular case, had nothing to do with Eve bearing Cain. Should it have been two sentences, or one? Once we begin to understand that Eve was pregnant with Cain BEFORE Adam ever knew her, we can realize Adam knowing Eve didn’t have anything to do with Eve bearing Cain. It’s the old concept of cause and effect. We could say we went to a movie one evening and the sun rose the next morning. If this was said, it would be true. But, even though it was true, it does not mean that the sun rising the next morning had anything to do with our having gone to a movie.

It would appear that Eve had Twins because Genesis 4:2 says, “...she again bore his brother Abel.” The word in Hebrew for “again” is #3254 and means “to continue something or to add.” In other words, after she bore Cain, she “continued” bearing Abel. We have heard some say that Abel wasn’t born for several years after Cain, but the Hebrew doesn’t support such an idea. The Hebrew word #3254 can also mean “conceive again,” but this does not seem to fit the context.

We will again quote John 8:44 from Smith and Goodspeed as we have done prior in this study. With this rendition, there can be little doubt the “Jews” are the genetic descendants of Satan:

“The devil is the father YOU ARE SPRUNG FROM, and you want to carry out your father’s wishes. He was a murderer from the first, and he has nothing to do with truth, for there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he speaks in his true character, for he is a liar and the father of them.”

This is what The Wycliffe Bible Commentary has to say concerning this verse, page 109:

“The true reason for their [the Jews] failure to receive him [Yahshua] was their KINSHIP WITH THE DEVIL. HE WAS THEIR FATHER. No wonder they acted as he does (cf. Matthew 23:15). His special sins are lying (seen in connection with the temptation in the garden) and murder (in the INCITEMENT of Cain to slay his brother: 1 John 3:12).”

Please notice the word “KINSHIP” here. It’s not talking about something “spiritual,” but LITERAL and GENETIC. The Matthew Henry’s Commentary understands it this way also, volume 5, page 999:

“Having thus DISPROVED THEIR RELATION BOTH TO ABRAHAM and to God [Yahweh], he comes next to tell them plainly whose children they were: You are of your father the devil, v. 44. If they were not God’s [Yahweh’s] children, they were the devil’s, for God [Yahweh] and Satan divide the world of mankind; the devil is therefore said to work in the children of disobedience, (Ephesians 2:2)...All wicked people are the devil’s children,

children of Belial (2 Corinthians 6:15), the serpent's seed (Genesis 3:15), children of the wicked one, (Matthew 13:38). They partake of his nature, bear his image, obey his commands, and follow his example..."

These last two quotations are simply brilliant, yet slightly flawed. We believe it is simply amazing that these commentators had moments of inspiration, for the message of Two Seedline and Israel Identity were not to be revealed until the end time, according to Matthew 13:37-43. This passage indicates

- 1). The tares will be gathered and burned, and then;
- 2). The wheat will be gathered into the Kingdom.

Here the tares are those of the Satanic-Seedline, while the wheat are true Israel. While both of these messages are important, for the moment, the Two Seedline message has priority, for the majority of Israelites will not understand their Identity until after the tares are cast into the fire. With the Two Seedline message coming to the forefront, they are, at the present time, beginning to feel the heat. If you haven't, as yet, grasped the Two Seedline message, maybe it isn't your time to understand it. If you do fathom this message, we would encourage you to promote it, for it is the message of the hour.

For yet another comment on John 8:44, we will use the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible, page 1046:

"Ye are of your father the devil; 'this is one of the most decisive testimonies of the objective (outward) personality of the devil. It is quite impossible to suppose an accommodation to Jewish [Hebrew] views, or a metaphorical form of speech, in so solemn an assertion as this' [Aloford]. The lusts of your father; his impure malignant, ungodly propensities, inclinations, desires, ye would do; are willing to do; not of any blind necessity of nature, but of PURE NATURAL INCLINATION."

We will not consider some of the passages quoted here by these various commentaries, starting with Matthew 13:38 which reads:

"The field is the world; the good seed are the CHILDREN OF THE KINGDOM; but the tares are the CHILDREN OF THE WICKED ONE."

Children: Strong's Concordance: #5207 huios (hwee-os'); apparently a primary word; a "son" (sometimes of animals), used very widely of immediate, remote or figuratively, kinship: KJV-- child, foal, son.

Children: Thayer's Definition: #5207 huios-

- 1) a son
  - a) rarely used for the young of animals
  - b) generally used of the offspring of men
  - c) in a restricted sense, the male offspring (one born by a

father and of a mother)

d) in a wider sense, a descendant, one of the posterity of any one,

1) the children (sons) of Israel

2) sons of Abraham

e) used to describe one who depends on another or is his follower; a pupil

2) son of man

a) term describing man, carrying the connotation of weakness and mortality

b) son of man, symbolically denotes the fifth kingdom in

Daniel 7:13 and by this term its humanity is indicated in contrast with the barbarity and ferocity of the four preceding kingdoms (the Babylonian, the Median and the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman) typified by the four beasts. In the book of Enoch (2nd century) it is used of the Christ (the Son of Man).

c) used by Christ himself, doubtless in order that he

might intimate his Messiahship and also that he might designate himself as the head of the human race, the man, the one who both furnished the pattern of the perfect man and acted on behalf of all mankind. Christ seems to have preferred this to the other Messianic titles, because by its lowliness it was least suited to foster the expectation of an earthly Messiah in royal splendor.

3) son of God

a) used to describe Adam (Lk. 3:38)

b) used to describe those who are born again (Lk. 20:36)

and of angels and of Jesus Christ (Son of God)

c) used of those whom God esteems as sons, whom He loves, protects and benefits above others

1) in the Old Testament, used of the Jews

2) in the New Testament, used of Christians



3) those whose character God, as a loving father,

shapes by chastisements (Heb. 12:5-8)

d) those who revere God as their father, the pious

worshippers of God, those who in character and life resemble God, those who are governed by the Spirit of God, repose the same calm and joyful trust in God which children do in their parents (Rom. 8:14, Gal. 3:26 and hereafter in the blessedness and glory of the life eternal will openly wear this dignity of the sons of God. A term used preeminently of Jesus Christ, as enjoying the supreme love of God, united to Him in affectionate intimacy, privy to his saving councils, obedient to the Father's will in all His acts

As you can see: The word “children,” in this passage, is the Greek word #5207, and means “legitimate sons” as opposed to #3541 “illegitimate sons.”

How fitting is the use of this Greek term in this particular verse, for this is exactly what this passage is speaking about. In other words, it is addressing the legitimate (lawfully begotten) sons of Adam-Israel and the legitimate (lawful begotten) sons of Satan. While it is true there was nothing “legitimate” or “lawful” concerning the birth of Cain, nevertheless the Greek words make it quite clear there are a GENUINE and COUNTERFEIT children spoken of. It might be said, more or less, in this manner: “the unlawful and illegitimate sons of Satan are his lawful responsibility.”

The Wycliffe Bible Commentary has the following to say in respect to this verse:

“The field is the world. Not the Church. Children of the kingdom. As in the explanation of The Sower, the seed is here regarded as having produced plants (Matthew 13:19). The springing up of Christ’s true followers in this world is counterfeited by the devil, WHOSE CHILDREN OFTEN MASQUERADE AS BELIEVERS (2 Corinthians 11:13-15).” (Verses 13:8 and 23 would be more relevant than 13:19)

As 2 Corinthians 6:15 was referred to by Matthew Henry, let’s talk a look at that one next. We will quote verses 14, 16 & 17 as well, for they are pertinent to the passage. While this passage strongly commands we are not to have common ground with people of a different race or species, it also charges us to have no fellowship with the wicked unbelievers, especially the “Jews.” If you will check your center reference, you will notice that it takes you to ‘Deuteronomy 7:2-3 where we are instructed not to MINGLE with the Canaanites representative of today’ “Jews.” Apparently, the anti-seedliner haven’t learned this very important lesson yet:

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Yahshua with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of Yahweh with idols? For ye are the temple of the living Elohim; as Yahweh hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their Elohim. And they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and BE YE SEPARATE, saith Yahweh, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you.”

We will not take a survey of what various commentaries state on this passage. As this is a very important part of the Two Seedline message, we should take special note of the following:

The Believer's Bible Commentary, by William MacDonald, page 1845:

"This section of 2 Corinthians is one of the key passages in all the word of God (Yahweh) on **THE SUBJECT OF SEPARATION**. It is clear instruction that the believer should separate himself from unbelievers, iniquity, darkness, Belial, idols...Neither can light have communion with darkness. When light enters a room, the darkness is dispelled. Both cannot exist together at the same time."

The Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible abridged by Ralph Earle, page 1140:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. This is a military term: keep in your own ranks; do not leave the Christian community to join in that of the heathens...As righteousness cannot have communion with unrighteousness, and **LIGHT** cannot dwell with **DARKNESS**."

The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible, page 2243:

"...As Satan is opposed to God (Yahweh), and Antichrist to Christ; Belial being here opposed to Christ, must denounce all manner of Antichristian uncleanness (Bengel). He that believeth with an infidel; Translate, to 'a believer with an unbeliever.'"

The Wycliffe Bible Commentary contributes this on page 1273:

"The word concord (sankatathesis) is found only here in the New Testament. The holiness and purity of Christ (Yahshua) cannot harmonize with the wickedness and impurity of Belial (a synonym for Satan). Cf. 1 Corinthians 10:21...The word agreement (sunkatathesis) climaxes the four previous words that Paul used to express sinful union between **THE SONS OF GOD (Yahweh)** and **THE CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL**. This word suggests a sympathetic union of mind and will in a plan mutually agreed to...God (Yahweh) cannot lovingly entertain those who are knowingly and willingly involved in evil."

From the Matthew Poole's Commentary On The Holy Bible we get the following, volume 3, page 618:

"It is a metaphor drawn from horses or oxen/ which should draw together, being in the same yoke, neither standing still, nor yet holding back. It is a general precept, prohibitive of all unnecessary communication and intimate fellowship with such, as either in matters of faith or worship, or in their lives and conversations, [who] declare themselves to be unbelievers...And what concord hath Christ with Belial?, Christ, who is the Head of believers...and to him who is the head of all unbelievers, and **THE GOD OF THE WORLD**...therefore we ought to have no unnecessary communication with such who manifest themselves **TO BE OF THEIR FATHER THE DEVIL**..."

The Matthew Henry's Commentary has this to say concerning this passage, volume y, page 625:

“It is an unequal yoking of things together that will not agree together; as bad as...to have ploughed with an ox and an ass or TO HAVE SOWN DIVERS SORTS OF GRAIN INTERMIXED. What an absurdity is it to think of joining righteousness and unrighteousness, or mingling light and darkness...and what comfortable communion can these have together? Christ (Yahshua) and Belial are CONTRARY ONE TO THE OTHER; THEY HAVE OPPOSITE INTERESTS AND DESIGNS, SO THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE THERE COULD BE ANY CONCORD OR AGREEMENT BETWEEN THEM... therefore, the exhortation is (v. 17) to come out from THEM, and keep at a due distance, TO BE SEPARATE, as one would avoid the society of those who have the leprosy or the plague, for fear of taking infection...”

There probably is no better an example of fellowship of “light” with “darkness” than the blatant organization “The International Fellowship of Christians and Jews,” 309 W. Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois. They say their aim is:

“Working to strengthen Christian-Jewish understanding on issues of shared concern.”

Supporters of this organization are Judeo-Christian ministers like Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, Pat Boone, Jack Hayford, Rabbi Yechiel Eshkstein, Senator Joseph Lieberman, Charles Colson, Sallai Meridor, Yuli Edelstein, Zvi Raviv, and Ehud Olmer among others. And, let’s not forget John Hagee, as he is really in bed with the “Jews.”

They promote a program called “On Wings Of Eagles” where they dupe the ignorant Judeo-Christians into donating money to fly a “Jew” from Russia to Jerusalem, and help them to get established with a job, home and food when they get there.

For more books by Willie Martin and other Christian patriot authors, please visit the [Christian Identity Forum](#).